DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 831 UD 023 490

AUTHOR Passow, A. Harry
TITLE A Cross-National View of Education and Socialization of Immigrant Youth.
PUB DATE Mar 84
NOTE 30p.; Paper prepared for the fiftieth anniversary conference of Youth Aliyah on "Education and Cultural Transition: The Case of Immigrant Youth" (Jerusalem, Israel, March 26-28, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Acculturation; Biculturalism; Bilingualism; Compensatory Education; *Cultural Pluralism; *Developed Nations; Educational Objectives; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnic Groups; *Immigrants; Minority Groups; Non English Speaking; Relocation
IDENTIFIERS Australia; Council for Cultural Cooperation (France); Council of Europe (France); Great Britain; Sweden; West Germany

ABSTRACT

The education and socialization of immigrant children and youths is a problem for educators and policy makers around the world, particularly in developed countries. The challenge is to achieve social equality or at least equal social opportunity for minorities; the dilemma is whether the culture of these immigrants should be replaced by that of the majority or consciously preserved. This problem is complicated by the fact that minority members differ in their relationship to each other, their culture, and the majority society. The Council of Europe sees "interculturalism" as the basic concept to guide teachers working with migrant and native youth, but this approach has been interpreted in a variety of ways. West Germans assume that the immigrants will eventually return to their homeland, and provide compensatory schooling designed to aid them during their stay. Sweden and Britain assume that the immigrants intend to stay. Sweden takes a bilingual and bicultural approach, encouraging the acquisition of both Swedish and English; the British regard immigration as a race relations problem, and strongly stress the need for English as a second language. Australia has traditionally been xenophobic, but has recently accepted more immigrants of non-European ancestry. Early policies were essentially assimilationist, but new settlers have developed their own ethnic schools, and there is an increasing understanding of the need for multiculturalism in Australia. In all cases, educators see cultural pluralism as a new challenge for schools and teachers, and are altering their concepts of what schools can and cannot do. (CJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED242831

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. Harry Passow
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A Cross-National View of Education and Socialization of Immigrant Youth

A. Harry Passow

Jacob H. Schiff Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

In countries around the world, but especially in the developed nations, the education and socialization of immigrant children and youth are a concern for educators, policy makers and lay persons. In the United States, for example, there are millions of children of legal and illegal immigrants enrolled in schools, many with mother tongues other than English, many with culturally different backgrounds, and most with rural rather than urban backgrounds. All over Europe, the children of what are known as "guestworkers" as well as other immigrants move back and forth and must be schooled and socialized. In Australia, there have been several waves of immigration and, most recently, the children of Vietnam refugees have been admitted to schools, posing somewhat different challenges from those posed by earlier ethnic groups. Great Britain has been faced with an immigrant school population since the 1950s when sizeable numbers of groups from various British Commonwealth nations began immigrating, starting with Cypriots, Hindis and Pakistanis, and followed by West Indians and others.

A paper prepared for the Fiftieth Anniversary Conference of Youth Aliyah on "Education and Cultural Transition: The Case of Immigrant Youth," Jerusalem, 26-28th March 1984.

UD023490

In this paper, I will take a brief look at how some countries other than Israel educate and socialize their immigrant children and youth and try to draw some generalizations from these observations. Because my time is limited, I will only sample a few program to provide a flavor of policies, programs and issues raised cross-nationally. The examples I will use are not really random but chosen because of what they illustrate.

OECD and Council of Europe Countries

Churchill has observed: "In almost all OECD countries the education of linguistic and cultural minorities has become a problem of importance parallel to the now traditional areas of special education concern-- the handicapped, the disadvantaged, the retarded and the gifted."[1] Not all linguistic and cultural minority youth are immigrants, of course, but in many instances they are. Churchill argues that:

> the fundamental change...has been taking place during the past 20 years in the definition of the content of social equality or, even, of equal social opportunity for minorities. At the one end is the definition saying that minority social groups will be accepted into full social participation after their language and culture, at least in the conduct of community life, will have been replaced by that of the majority. At the other end is the definition saying that equality consists in the preservation of minority languages and the cultures whose social status would be equal to that of the majority.[2]

Among the most significant differences among the various minorities and immigrant groups are such demographic facts as numbers, geographical concentration, relative numbers as part of the total population and recency of arrival. Groups differ as well, Churchill points out, in "the way the members of the minority relate to each other, to their own linguistic and cultural tradition, and to the majority society."[3] Churchill notes that:

> The principal motor force that drives forward the policy making process to accomodate the needs of linguistic and cultural minorities, is

political pressure from the minorities themselves. This is an odd situation, since they are often among the least powerful members of societies in which they live. In the United States they are often citizens but fall into categories whose place in the socio-economic sphere is very low. In Europe resident foreign workers constitute an important sub-class within most countries, playing a major role in keeping the wheels of industry turning but lacking the right to participate even in local elections, except in one or two jurisdictions (Sweden, in particular).

. . . . . .

With few exceptions, it appears that the minorities make their political force felt indirectly through moral and practical pressures that affect members of the majority group and, in particular, educators who must cope with the problems that minority children encounter in schools.[4]

For at least a dozen years, the Council of Europe, through its Council for Cultural Cooperation has been concerned with the education and cultural development of migrant youth. The Council began by analyzing some significant pilot projects in the field of teacher training in member countries and then producing dossiers containing information about the different cultures and education systems of migrant-receiving countries andcountries of origin. Information on the social situation, the family and the school system of each of 15 nations is presented and, for eight of the countries, there is information on the sociocultural situation of migrants and their families. The dossier material is aimed at informing teachers and to improve their intercultural training.

The Council's position has been presented as follows:

...we believe it is the duty of the schools, training institutions and government of the immigration and emigration countries (and possibly that of the Council of Europe) to help them:

--to accept the migrant child, adolescent or adult as he is and adapt their action to his needs (which they must learn to discover);

--to enable him to settle in society and achieve his full affective and intellectual development and his personal fulfillment in the receiving country, with its own nationals, with the prospect of their dynami mutual enrichment;

--to place value on his cultural identity and mother tongue as a necessary condition for his proper development;

--to offer him equal opportunities with regard to schooling, study and occupational training;

--to promote the coordination of educational targets and the equivalence of qualifications in the various countries concerned in order to facilitate his mobility and return to his country of origin if desired;

--to accept adults and children who return as they are and to multiply efforts in the emigration countries to facilitate their resettlement in such a way as to make use of their special experience, which could also bring cultural enrichment to their own country.[5]

The Council for Cultural Co-operation's School Education Division sees "interculturalism or intercultural education" as the basic concept to guide teachers and teacher training in working with migrant children and youth as well as those from the receiving country. As the chairman of the Council's group of experts put it:

> The migration phenomenon does not concern migrants alone, but the whole community, in the receiving countries and in the countries of origin alike. It is a matter of encounter, where each culture is challenged, it is true, but also, if it is receptive to other cultures, is enriched by their values.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> ...an intercultural education that allows for differences and is receptive to different values seems to us not only a necessity, since it is the only kind of education that can meet the needs of Europe today and tomorrow in a world where interchange, mobility and interdependence are on the increase, but also extremely positive and fruitful.[6]

Needless to say, the facts of how different countries in Europe receive immigrants and their families, are not exactly in accord with the ideals Allmen expressed. Some specifics concerning some European countries follow.

Federal Republic of Germany

In 1981, there were almost 4 million foreigners living in West Germany-- three fourths of them coming from six countries: Turkey, Yugo-

slavia, Italy, Greece, Spain and Portugal. One in four has lived in West Germany for 10 or more years and 60% for six or more years. These migrants came because they found what their home countries could not provide--employment. Most intended to stay only two or three years before going home to their families with as much money as they could save. However, the prolonged period of stay resulted in more and more migrant workers bringing their families to join them. By 1981, the foreign population was 6% of the total population and "brought with it numerous problems which neither the foreigners themselves, nor their host country perceived sufficiently clearly enough."[7]

Almost 55% of foreigners are aged 21-45, compared with 34% of the Germans in the same age bracket. The number of children under age 15 total 887,000 with almost half under the age of 6. The position of foreign workers in the German society is affected by two factors: (1) "The individual's intention with regard to the moment of his return to his home country substantially affects the degree of integration in the Federal Republic of Germany" and (2) "The foreigner's way of life...is also influenced by where he lives. Many foreigners live in areas which most Germans have left (e.g. old parts of the city, the city centre, industrial estate) and where they are practically alone with their fellow-countrymen in a kind of ghetto, with its own shops and restaurants etc..."[8] Housing is generally inferior although it has improved somewhat over the years. Most migrant workers are employed in jobs which, as a result of the economic boom between 1963-73, Germans no longer wished to do. These are usually dirty, dangerous or strenuous occupations.

The migrant child's relationships wothin the family is complex and

problematic, varying with the circumstances. Some children have lived with relatives at home, have been separated for a long period from their parents, and have had to establish new relationships. They have varying commands of the German language, sometimes inadequate knowledge of the mother tongue, and varying attitudes toward the German environment and their chances of being integrated into it. The older family members tend to retain the traditions and ways of the home country which are often incomprehensible for their children but also impedes certain forms of integration. Some families "become more closely-knit so as to form a kind of alliance to protect them from, and help and help them stand up to, the difficulties of what is...an alien environment."[9] Because most foreigners come to the F.R.G. to earn money and then returning later,

> the integration problems of the children at school and elsewhere are often regarded as a temporary nuisance and consequently dismissed. The seriousness of the psychological strains on the children is often not understood or misunderstood. It is far more common to find "latch-key children" among foreigners than among German youngsters, because both their parents and often their older brothers and susters too go out to work.[10]

Acquiring command of German is seen as absolutely essential if migrant children are to take advantage of vocational training opportunities, of engaging in other types of secondary education, and to become integrated. This does not mean "that they will be 'Germanised' or estranged from their own cultures, The government's view is "that the best possible education and training in Germany, with the corresponding qualifications, also constitutes a good basis for a possible subsequent return to the home country, on condition, of course, that at the same time, the children's native language is preserved and promoted."[11] The official policy of the Federal Länder is stated in the its recommendation of 8 April 1976 that:

> The aim is to enable foreign schoolchildren to learn the German language and obtain German school qualifications as well as to maintain and develop their knowledge of their native language. At the same time educational activities are intended to contribute to the social integration of foreign children for the period of their stay in the Federal Republic of Germany. They should also serve to maintain their linguistic and cultural identity.[12]

School attendance is compulsory (nine-years of full-time schooling and three years of vocational school, even if less is required in the home country). In principle, "the migrant children are treated exactly the same as German children with regard to "school medical services, accident and liability insurance, careers guidance, learning aids, transport to school, educational and training grants and other benefits." [13] In principle, foreign children are enrolled in the class which best corresponds to their age or ability. Hamburg offers six-month "preparatory classes" for future school beginners. If needed, extra help with German language is also provided. Ordinarily, the number of foreign children in ordinary school classes is limited to 20% unless they can participate in class work without language difficulties. In some Länder where the proportion of foreign children of the same age is much greater than 20%, special classes may be organized when there are 25 or more children with the same native language. For four years in mist Länder but in all nine years in others, subjects in such classes are taught in the native language on the basis of the German curriculum and German is taught as a foreign language. Special coaching is provided pupils who need extra help with the German language. In addition, to facilitate school and social integration, help with home-work/supervised homework periods, play afternoons, pre-school activities are arranged for by either schools or voluntary bodies. Some Länder are collaborating in publishing translations of German textbooks and work is also under way on bilingual editions of some textbooks.

Migrant youth who have not reached the required standard are provided with foreign language courses and intensive courses at vocational schools. Where there are sufficient foreign pupils with the same mother tongue, instruction during the preparatory vocational school year may be given in that language. To enable migrant youth to retain links with their mother tongue and culture, up to five periods a week may be provided in native language instruction, sometimes by foreign teachers whose language is the same. Migrant children and youth are treated the same as German children with respect to school grades except that special understanding is to be shown for language difficulties. Migrant children may sometimes get a mark for achievements in their native language.

In all Länder, efforts are made to cover the special tasks connected with teaching foreign pupils in teacher training programs. Some Länder have an additional qualification for "German as a foreign language." Foreign teachers have to have completed their teacher training in their home countries and prove that they have sufficient knowledge of German. In some countries, German Goethe Institutes provide opportunities for studying German. Some Länder reduce the size of classes.

In his penetrating analysis of the education of migrant children and youth titled, Guestworkers in Germany: The Prospects for Pluralism, Ray C. Rist observed that: "The matter of equality of educational opportunity simply does not fit into the current structure of German education, whether foreign children or native."[14] Further, "Whatever the limitations and denials of opportunity a German child of low socioeconomic background may experience in the German schools, the conditions are more restrictive and prohibitive

for the guestworker children. On this group falls the full weight of the traditionalism, selectivity, elitism, and rigidity inherent in German education."15 Rist observes that migrant children and youth have few advantages upon which to draw in order to succeed in the opportunities they are offered in school. Consequently, migrant youth are hard pressed to even meet minimum standards and that only .046 percent of all students in Gymnasium are from guestworkers homes.16

Sweden

Sweden has been receiving what is perceived there as "large numbers of immigrants" since World War II. In 1978, it was estimated that 10% of the population were immigrants. Probably 60% of these immigrants are from Nordic countries, especially Finland; 20% are from Mediterranean countries (primarily Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey); and 7% from countries outside Europe. At the beginning of 1981, a total of 422,000 foreign nationals were living in Sweden, a third of whom were children and as many as 70% of these children were either born in Sweden or had been living in the country for at least five years-- the residency requirement period for citizenship. Foreign nationals accounted for 5% of the nation's entire work force.

In the mid-1960s a debate began concerning the social situation of immigrants in Sweden: "Should the objective be the full assimilation of immigrants into Swedish cultural life, or should the various immigrant groups be given the chance to preserve their distinctive ethnic identities?"17 Following a study by a Commission on Immigration between 1968-74, Parliament passed a bill in 1975 which provided new guidelines for a policy on behalf of immigrants and ethnic minorities, a policy based on three objectives:

"equality between immigrants and Swedes, cultural freedom of choice for immigrants, and co-operation and solidarity between the Swedish native majority and the various ethnic minorities."[18] EIFO (the Swedish Commission on Immigrant Research) is one of several groups studying immigrants and foreign nationals in that nation. The National Board of Education's HINVA group (derived from the Swedish for "action programme for immigrant affairs") has had an R&D project titled, "Schools, Immigrants and Society in Long-Term Perspective."

With respect to the immigrant policy and the schools, the concept of equality means that "the measures taken in schools must be aimed at making the educational situation of immigrant pupils equivalent to that of Swedish pupils." Schools must use means and methods "which will genuinely enable immigrant pupils to acquire knowledge and skills of the kind which educational legislation and the curricula make it the business of schools to provide. The concept of freedom of choice aims at enabling immigrants "to decide for themselves the extent to which they are to retain and develop their original identity and the extent to which they are to acquire a Swedish cultural identity." To achieve the aim of partnership, means "developing forms and methods of co-operation with immigrant parents and other parents in order to strengthen their ability to play an active part in and influence their children;s school careers, and it will also mean training, in-service training, and information to influence attitudes and values." [19]

In 1976 the Riksdag resolved that all children were to be assured the right to native language training if a language other than Swedish "constituted a living element in their domestic surroundings." Due to financial

constraints and a shortage of native language teachers, the resource was limited to six-year olds, i.e., pre-schoolers. This is provided in a variety of pre-school and day care institutions. A 1982 study indicated that roughly 60% of all enrolled pre-school children having home languages other than Swedish received home-language training.[20]

At the compulsory schooling level, the home language reform act made it possible for immigrant children with native languages other than Swedish to obtain home language instruction. Instruction for immigrant pupils is organized in one of four ways:

-- Ordinary class, which the pupil can leave temporarily for home language instruction and/or supportive teaching.

-- Integrated class, comprising a group of Swedish-speaking pupils and a group of pupils sharing another home language, a considerable amount of instruction in this class being given in the home language.

-- Home language class, consisting entirely of pupils sharing a language other than Swedish. Practically all teaching here is in the home language, but lessons in Swedish as a foreign language are also included.

-- Preparatory class (a temporary arrangement), comprising pupils from one or more language groups. Instruction here can be in Swedish, but the pupils also can be given home language lessons and study guidance in their home language.[21]

In the education of immigrants in Sweden, bilingualism and biculturalism are seen as central aims of education since "the migrants' children must be able to understand both their country of origin and the host country."[22] Sweden's policy regarding home language instruction is aimed at providing "at least the foundations of the first language which will serve not only to develop it but also a second one."[23] A good many studies have been done on bilingualism in Swedish schools and Christina Bratt Paulston summed up her critical view of the Swedish research and debate

about bilingualism as follows;

1. The immigrant children do as well in school as Swedish children...
2. The immigrant children demonstrate a string tendency to shift to Swedish.
3. The Swedish population shows strong xenophobic inclinations....
4. Immigrant children's special teachers tend to be untrained in mother tongue teaching as well as Swedish as a foreign language...
5. Many is not most proponents for mother tongue teaching have a vested interest in the maintained lack of assimilation of migrant children....
6. Semilingualism does not exist, or put in a way which is non-refutable, has never been empirically demonstrated. [24]

Paulson concluded that: "Any decent interpretation of freedom of choice must support the children in their voluntary assimilation with combined classes, which they themselves find important..., and a strong support of Swedish as a foreign language.... By being allowed to assimilate and incorporate, they will with time become good Swedes, and Sweden herself will be richer for enhanced cultural ties to the rest of Europe."[25]

The official Swedish immigrant policy "is for the immigrant to be supported in retaining and developing various cultural traits from his original culture. In order for this to succeed, the values, religion, language, customs and habits, etc. represented by the immigrant must be regarded as positive to Sweden and as a beneficial influence on social development."[26] Changing attitudes of students, teachers, and adults is a complex and difficult undertaking. The fact that Swedish culture and society may be very different from the rural, underdeveloped societies from which many of the immigrants come creates conflicts within families and among generations that affects and is affected by the differences between

immigrant and Swedish societal groups. Literacy and illiteracy in the mother tongue by adults affects the education and socialization of their children. Parents may be under considerable emotional strain:

> The adult may be deeply dissatisfied and unhappy about living in Sweden and somewhat taken aback at the traditions, standards, customs and normal-- or perhaps imagined--behaviour of Swedes. Some immigrants never really settlem but convince themselves that they will be returning to their country of origin so soon that it is not worth learning Swedish. These often overlook the fact that the best part of their children's development takes place in Sweden, that much of it is irreversible, and that children may be unable to adapt to their parents' home country when the latter are ready to return.[27]

This is true even though Sweden probably has one of the most extensive act which provides for statutory Swedish lessons for immigrants. Since July 1973, certain foreign employees are entitled by law to 240 hours' paid leave to attend Swedish language and social education lessons.[28] Adult education in Sweden has attracted more and more immigrants. For one thing, immigrants tend to have poorer paying jobs and are subject to more frequent layoffs so that they are eligible for labour market training (AMU) programs. For adults, one find adult education associations, general study circles, home language study circles as well as folk high schools involving and attended by immigrants.

Comparison of British and Swedish Policies

Ann-Margaret Fris has done a comparative study of how policies regarding the education of immigrants and minorities in Britain and Sweden over a 25 uear period. In both cases, she notes, both nations initially encouraged immigration and only later did they realize the implications for the education and socialization of the children.

In Britain, no materials were published in the field of immigrant

education to hel! teachers cope with the new tasks and difficulties they were encountering until 1965: "Only gradually the new problems of immigrant pupils, such as culture shock, inadequate English and difficulties related to foreign traditions and habits, became apparent on a national scale."[29] Local education authorities in areas with high concentrations of immigrants, with the help of Her Majesty's Inspectors became aware of the problems. The Department of Education and Science published to reports: The Education of Immigrants (1971) which was a survey of policy issues and tasks of immigrant education at all levels and The Continuing Needs of Immigrants (1972), a report of a study on how immigrant pupils were doing in secondary schools and what adaptations were being made for them.

As early as 1965, however, there was concern about the concentrations of immigrant children in certain areas of England. A Department Circular (7/65) caused considerable controversy by suggesting that immigrant children be dispersed if they constituted more than 30 percent of the population in any one school. The circular also made suggestions concerning the language education of the immigrants, the need for teaching indigenous English children about Commonwealth countries so that they would understand their immigrant schoolmates, the need for increasing teachers in schools with immogrant children and adding social workers, among others.

It was quite awhile before colleges and schools of education paid attention to the needs of immigrant children and to the teacher trainees' needs to be prepared to teachin in a multicultural society. Several committees discussed this need and the James Report (Teacher Education

and Training, 1972) recommended "that all [teacher trainees] should be made aware that Britain is a multi-cultural society and that this should leaven all their teaching in the future."[30]

Fris observes that both Britain and Sweden have built their immigrant policies on the assumption that the immigrants have come to stay, and have not treated them as a temporary phenomenon as do many other countries. Since World War II, two relatively linguistically and culturally homogeneous countries have become multicultural due to immigration. In both cases, immigrant pupils have concentrated in major industrial areas and have created the same kind of problems in both nations. While both countries have compulsory education to age 16, the British system is more decentralized and diversified than the Swedish one.

Fris notes both similarities and differences in the policies toward immigrant children and youth in Britan and Sweden. The important similarities include the following:

-- In both countries responsible authorities were initially rather unaware of the fact that specific measures ought to be taken to support immigrant children in education.

-- Special resources are now available in both countries for immigrant education.

-- The acquisition of the major language has been emphasized in both countries, even if the problem was observed earlier in Britain.

-- There is central and local support in both countries for bi-lingualism among the national minorities-- the Welsh and the Lapps.

-- There are university courses in both countries for English and Swedish respectively as a second language to train teachers of immigrant children.

-- Housing and working conditions for immigrants were taken into account earlier than educational needs.[31]

Despite communality in background, there are major differences between the policies of the two countries. These include:

-- There is a wider variety of arrangements for immigrant pupils in Britain than in Sweden due to local autonomy.

-- Resources for immigrant education are relatively more limited in Britain than in Sweden.

-- Both countries have received immigrants from many different countries but in the British policy most interest has been focused on immigrants from the East Indies and the Indian subcontinent.

--The role of the mother tongue is a major issue in Sweden and all children are entitled to mother tongue teaching, whereas in Britain this has not been the case. The mother tongue has normally not been included in the curriculum, but a few projects have started recently. The EEC Directive concerning mother tongue teaching for migrant workers' children has caused discussion.

-- Multicultural aspects of education for all children have been more emphasized in Britain than in Sweden.

-- Gypsy children are entitlted to mother tongue teaching in Sweden like other minority children, but in Britain teachers have been recommended not to use Romany words in the classroom.[32]

In Britain, immigrant policy issues are treated as race relation problems since physical characteristics are more obvious in Britain than in Sweden but even in Sweden physical differences cannot be disregarded. Differences in language have become more conspicuous in Sweden than in Britain. Sweden sees minority mother tongue languages as important, providing a basis for personal and cultural identity. In Sweden, English as a world language is a compulsory subject for all students, constituting a third language for many immigrants. In Britain, the majority language and the world language are the same and British educators see it as terribly important that immigrants learn English as fast and as thoroughly as possible. The British are far less open to other languages than English than are the Swedish. Fris notes a "trend

toward policies on a supernational level observed in the European Economic Community Directive on education of migrant workers' children.

Australia

In 1948, Australia modified its relatively exclusionist policy towards non-British people and accepted 170,000 European refugees during the next three years, mainly from Poland and Baltic states. This was followed by significant numbers of Dutch, Germans, Italians and Maltese in the 1950s and early 1960s; Greeks and Yugoslavs during the 1960s and early 1970s; and some 40 or more countries as well. The current official policy calls for "90,000 new arrivals per year, selected on the basis of family reunion, economic contribution or potential adaptability to Australian society." [33] In 1978, Australia agreed to accept 10,200 Indo-Chinese refugees, 13,900 more in 1979, and 15,300 in 1980. These were in addition to the regular immigration permitted. It was only in 1966 that an early policy which excluded persons of non-European ancestry was relaxed. By 1981, about 25 percent (excluding about 150,000 Aborigines) of the population was born elsewhere than Australia. Among Australian policy makers, the assumption has always been that migration is oriented towards permanent settlement of families and not toward individual guest workers as in many European countries.

Because of its earlier policies, only in the past 30 years has there been an influx of non-English speaking immigrants. For the most part, although they vary widely in the level of education depending on their country of origin, immigrants to Australia tend to "have primary education only, and some are effectively illiterate in any language despite a requirement

of literacy in the selection process. Tertiary level education is more typical of refugees than of voluntary immigrants."[34] Taft and Cahill point out that "the nationalities and languages of immigrants arriving in any year are heterogeneous and are constantly changing... according to conditions in the countries of origin;" that immigrants "tend to live in groups in specific districts of the main urban areas, but mobility is quick and most new immigrants move on within a few years to areas of second and third settlement;" and that the large Roman Catholic immigrant groups tend to enroll their children in fee-paying Catholic schools from the time of arrival.[35]

Until the change in immigration policy, Taft and Cahill assert, "the Australian community held comfortable ethnocentric and xenophobic attitudes."[36] Since then attitudes have varied depending on the economy. When there is unemployment, attiudes toward immigrants and immigration are antagonistic.

Until rather recently, the official policy regarding the absorption of immigrants was one of total assimilation and Anglo-conformity: "no possibility of a long-term linguistic or cultural rival was admitted, ethnic distinctiveness was not encouraged and it was considered that the quicker the assimilation to the pre-eminent Anglo-Saxon core culture, the better for the unity and uniformity of the Australian nation."[37] The school system reflected this attitude until the 1960s. The period 1965-75 is seen as the transitional phase--"the continuing arrival of large numbers of non-English speaking children from poorly educated, low-skilled families in the 1960s led to a distinct shift in emphasis from the adaptation successes of immigrant children to a concern with their problems."[38]

In 1970, the federal government introduced a Child Migrant Education Program, totally oriented toward English as a Second Language (ESL). Originally conceived as a stop-gap measure to provide for children whose mother tongue was not English, CMEP "opened a Pandora's box of new realisations, greater difficulties, fresh insights and new initiatives."[39] Within a few years, the program was greatly expanded, major research programs had been planned, and teacher training programs were dealing with issues of educating children in a multilingual, culturally pluralistic society. Between 1970 and 1977, the allocation for the CMEP program grew from $1.8 million to $ 26.4 million to pay for training of "migrant English teachers" and to provide for equipment and materials. The number of specialist teachers expanded from 246 to 2,095 in four years. Originally aimed at providing instruction in basic English, CMEP soon provided an orientation to the Australian community.

In the past decade or so, there has also been an explosion in the number of "ethnic schools" as ethnic communities began to worry about the extinction of their national and cultural heritages. Most of the ethnic schools are part-time, established by ethnic communities, often sponsored by a religious group after-school or weekends. One estimate in 1980 was that "throughout Australia there are more than 97,000 students studying 45 different languages in about 1400 "after-hours ethnic schools", day schools and "insertion language" classes managed or sponsored by some 580 ethnic school authorities."[40] The aim of these schools "is to preserve cultural heritage and create a sense of ethnic identity through a study of religion, history, geography, etc." [41]

Noting that Australia opted for the ideology of multiculturalism

the Galbally Report (Migrant Services and Programs: Report of the Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services for Migrants) in 1978, Bullivant has raised the question: "Are ethnic schools the solution to ethnic children's accomodation to Australian society?"[42] After examining the aims of ethnic schools and criticizing some of these aims, Bullivant concludes:

> that if ethnic groups genuinely want to preserve their ethnic cultural traditions and languages, but at the same time enable their children to achieve worthwhile lives in Australian society and culture, then a compromise is theoretically possible, but organizationally, economically and politically difficult to achieve.[43]

Bullivant is convinced that ethnic supplementary schools cannot provide the solution to ethnic children's accomodation in Australia and argues that a different kind of institution is "needed to prepare ethnic children for life in both the private ethnic world and the public Western, industrialized world."[44] He sees the dual curriculum school (similar to the Jewish day school) as the compromise, aiming at preparing what he calls the hyphenated ethnic-- e.g., Greek-Australian, Italian-Australian, etc..

In a discussion of the educational consequences of multi-culturalism in Australia, Smolicz distinguished "between migrant education (the teaching of English as a second language), multicultural education (the teaching of community languages and knowledge of ethnic cultures to all Australian students) and ethnic education (the teaching of specific ethnic languages and cultures to members of the particular ethnic group). He favoured a place for all three aspects in the formal education system."[45]

Bullivant has written a number of articles examining the issues and controversies concerning multiculturalism in Australia and elsewhere. He notes that since the Galbally Report, ethnic community languages (especially

Greek and Italian, the largest groups) are now taight in some primary schools and the Federal government has encouraged and funded ethnic schools. In an article titled The Pluralist Dilemma, Bullivant suggests "on the basis of comparative evidence that multiculturalism could well be a massive confidence trick which claims to increase migrants' life chances, but in reality does little except offer bland palliatives."[46]

Beginning in 1978, Australia agreed to assist with the resettlement of refugees from Indo-China. Between 1978-1980, Australia accepted a total of 39,400 refugees, 20% of whom were between the ages of 5-14 and an additional 10-15% were 15-19 years old. A Contingency Program for Refugee Choldren was administered by the Commonwealth Department of Education until 1981. Recently an evaluation of the program which provided schooling for the Indo-Chinese refugees was completed. Students in Sydney and Melbourne schools in which the largest concentrations of such refugees were located and which had somewhat different schooling provisions were studied. The main focus was on (1) the environments in which special English education is undertaken and the effect of such factors as separation or inclusion in a school environment, metropolitan or provincial; (2) the amount of time needed in special English classes prior to transition; (3) the allocation of resources (including teachers, aides, materials); and (4) the outcomes in terms of the child's ability to comprehend, read, and write English and to make a transition to a school system."[47] The study showed steady improvement in the students' proficiency in English but their levels of attainment fell far short of expectations when the program was originally launched. The relatively low average levels of proficiency, the report speculates, may have been due to the refugee students' schooling and outlook

having been disrupted by violence and trauma. Twelve recommendations are made for improving instruction in English as a Second Language for refugee children and youth.[48]

The Commonwealth Department of Education has recently concluded several studies comparing migrant students of non-English speaking origin and students whose parents were born in an English-speaking country, both groups having attended Sydney high schools. The researchers described the migration experience in terms of both stunting and liberating theories:

> With the former, migration is seen as problem generating, resulting in personal loss of identity, disorganisation, social isolation and defensiveness, and cultural deprivation. With the latter, migrants are seen to benefit from participation in a multicultural arena, exposure to a broad range of alternatives and opportunities to contribute fresh ideas that can facilitate innovative change in society.[49]

The researchers studied family interests and social experience, students' perceptions of schooling, parents' perceptions of schooling, educational and occupational aspirations, accreditation and school performance, and characteristics of groups of students with different accreditation levels in comparing immigrant youth whose parents came from non-English speaking and English speaking countries. The data on families, Meade suggests, "may only be the tip of an iceberg in a sea of prejudice, intolerance, inflexibility, narrow-mindedness and refusal to examine 'taken-for-granted assumptions' which exist in the minds of many parents, of both Australian and NES origin. One can only be saddened by the lost opportunities for persoral enrichment and cultural development."[50]

Meade found that two-thirds of students left school before the high school certificwte and observes "that it is a gross oversimplification to conclude that all students who leave school have failed and reached the end of

their formal studies. Well over half the school leavers had gained high or medium IQ scores."[51] Meade also found "that the concept of 'migrant children as problems' widely misses the mark and is unlikely to contribute to a deeper understanding of the complex issues involved in analysing the educational experience of NES origin children...our data have brought into stark focus the existence of divisiveness and intolerance among families of ES and NES origins."[52]

The Australian Department of Education and Youth Affairs studied "Immigrant and Refugee Youth in the Transition from School to Work and Further Study" and found that

> the personal, social, educational and employment needs of members of this group [immigrant and refugee youth] are often not fully recognised, acknowledged or met. Lack of recognition of their particular vulnerability contributes to frustration and unhappiness, often with lifelong consequences for the more than four thousand 15- to 19-year olds who have come to Australia each year in recent years and to the thousands before them.[53]

Teenage immigrants, the study found, were subject to disorientation and dislocation in the immigration and settlement process. Many factors contribute to their being at risk and as seen by many employers as "unemployable": "Their standard of education, particularly their literacy and numeracy skills as well as their personal and social skills have been found to be inadequate, particularly in the workplace where communication and technology are increasingly sophisticated."[54] Immigrant youth who speak no English on arrival in Australia, the study found, were "at risk" in terms of their education and future employment. The report recommended developing more effective English as a Second Language programs; increase staffing for such programs; provide pre- and inservice training for teachers, assist financially students who, for good reasons, should live independently from their families;

and a high level policy review be undertaken "to consider the cost effectiveness and efficiency of present programs and identify administrative options."[55]

Some Concluding Observations

In this brief cross-national view of the education and socialization of immigrant youth, the United States has not been included because even a superficial discussion would have taken the entire paper. Nor has Israel been included because so many other presentations deal with the Israeli experience, particularly the unique contribution of Youth Aliyah.

Both the United States and Israel are essentially "nations of immigrants." For a good part of its history, the ideology which dominated immigration in the United States was the "melting pot" concept which aimed at rapid assimilation and "Americanization." During the past quarter of a century or so, the so-called "melting pot myth" has been shattered or at least sharply attacked. The growth of cultural pluralism, of multiculturalism, of bilingualism and of ethnicity has created new challenges for schools and teaching staffs. Issues concerning power and control of life chances of immigrant groups have revised our concepts of what schools can and cannot do, how educational institutions relate to immigrant families, to the community and to larger society. The range of ideologies and practices concerning immigration in the United is tremendously varied since there are factors such as race, class, caste, religion, legality, ethnicity, as well as other demographic factors such as concentration, recency of arrival, and native language which impact on education and socialization.

If one can judge from the reports of such bodies as the Council of Europe, at the government level there is a policy that immigrants and

their children should be helped "to settle in society and achieve [their] full affective and intellectual development and [their] personal fulfillment in the receiving country, with its own nationals, with the prospect of dynamic mutual enrichment." Between those expressions of policy and the actual behavior of both immigrants and nationals, there is a tremendous gap. In most societies and with few exceptions, immigrants do not enjoy full citizen rights, tend to be employed in poorest paying jobs, tend to live in worst housing and find their social and economic mobility impeded. Some observers may comment with a "What's new?" What seems to be new is that a number of nations have now become sensitive to the need for research and development regarding the education and socialization of immigrant youth, recognizing that the policies they develop must encompass much more than the what happens in that place called school. In those places called school, several "needs" seem fairly clear:

1. The need for developing instruction in the receiving country's language as rapidly and as effectively as possible.
2. The need for maintaining and developing the mother tongue, if the family desires that. However, in some countries, bilingualism or multilingualism is viewed as a positive aim for all immigrant students.
3. The need for multiculturalism or interculturalism and the nurturing of cultural pluralism as a general goal for schools.
4. The need for staff training to improve both pedagogical skills and personal attitudes of teachers, administrators and others who operate schools.
5. The need to develop instructional materials and resources which

respond to cultural pluralism and bilingualism.

6. The need to involve the family, the community and the school in mutually supportive relationships regarding education and welfare.
7. The need for developing appropriate paths for the transition from school to employment and further education.
8. The need for dealing effectively with the affective needs of immigrant children and youth as well as their intellectual needs.

The various documents sent in response to requests for information concerning policies, programs and research on the education and socialization of immigrant children and youth clearly indicate that this topic is a major concern for most developed nations. The ebb and flow of immigration in some areas of the world results in the education and socialization of returning emigrants as another area of concern.

As one reflects on what is happening with respect to educating and socializing immigrant youth around the world, the example of Youth Aliyah continues to be a bright light for other nations to study. Its most significant characteristic is that Youth Aliyah begins with a positive attitude-- the saving of Jewish children and youth. The consequence of that attitude and the policies and practices which accompany it is clear in the achievements of those who have experienced Youth Aliyah. Fifty years from now, we shall probably be celebrating the Centennial of Youth Aliyah, a Youth Aliyah which has realistically faced the changing times and adapted its policies, programs and practices to the changing needs of immigrant youth.

References

1. Stacy Churchill. "The Education of Linguistic and Cultural Minorities in OECD Countries." Unpublished paper. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Educational Studies, n.d., p. 1.

2. ibid., p. 4.

3. ibid., p. 6.

4. Stacy Churchill. "The Stages of Development of Policies for Education of Linguistic Minorities: A Cross-National Model." Unpublished paper. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Educational Studies, n.d., p. 4.

5. Micheline Rey-von Allmen. "Preface" in Louis Porcher, The Education of Children of Migrant Workers in Europe: Interculturalism and Teacher Training. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1981. p. 9.

6. ibid., p. 8.

7. Günter Mellinghaus. Dossiers for the Intercultural Training of Teachers: Federal Republic of Germany. Socio-Cultural Information. Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Co-operation, Council of Europe, 1981. p. 1.

8. ibid., pp. 3-4

9. ibid., p. 8.

10. ibid., p. 9.

11. ibid, p. 10.

12. ibid.

13. ibid.

14. Ray C. Rist. Guestworkers in Germany: The Prospects of Pluralism. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1978. p. 196.

15. ibid., p. 201.

16. ibid., p. 206.

17. Swedish Institute. Immigrants in Sweden. Fact Sheets on Sweden. Stockholm, August 1982. p. 1.

18 ibid. , p. 2.

19. National Swedish Board of Education. Immigrants and the Education System: An Action Programme for the Work of the National Board of Education in Connection with Immigrant Action. Stockholm: National Swedish Board of Education, 1979. p. 15.

20. Statistics Sweden. Immigrants and Immigrant Teaching in Sweden. Stockholm: Statistics Sweden, 1983. p. 28.

21. ibid., p. 32.

22. Britt-Ingrid Stockfelt-Moatson. Dossiers for the Intercultural Training of Teachers: The Sociocultural Situation of Migrants and Their Families in Sweden. Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Co-operation, Council of Europe, 1981. p. 26.

23. ibid.

24. Christina Bratt Paulston. Swedish Research and Debate About Bilingualism. Stockholm: National Swedish Board of Education, 1982. pp. 53-54.

25. ibid., pp. 54-55.

26. National Swedish Board of Education. op. cit., p. 17.

27. Stockfelt-Moatson., op. cit., p. 39.

28. Statistics Sweden. op. cit., p. 82.

29. Ann-Margaret Fris. Policies for Minority Education: A Comparative Study of Britain and Sweden. Stockholm: Institute of International Education, University of Stockholm, 1982. p. 103.

30. ibid., p. 108.

31. ibid., p. 174.

32. ibid., p. 175.

33. Ronald Taft and Desmond Cahill. "Education of Immigrants in Australia," in J. Bhatnagar. Educating Immigrants. London: Crook Helm, 1981, p. 17.

34. ibid., p. 20.

35. ibid.

36. ibid., p. 21

37. ibid., p. 24.

38. ibid., p. 26.

39. ibid., p. 27

40. Brian M. Bullivant. "Are Ethnic Schools the Solution to Ethnic Children's Accomodation to Australian Society?" Journal of Intercultural Studies Vo. 3, No. 2, 1982. p. 23.

41. Taft and Cahill, op. cit., p. 29

42. Bullivant, op. cit., p. 17.

43. ibid., pp. 17-18.

44. ibid., p. 32.

45. Taft and Cahill, op. cit., pp. 29-30.

46. Brian M. Bullivant. Personal letter dated January 12, 1984. See also Brian M. Bullivant. The Pluralist Dilemma in Education: Six Case Studies. Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1981.

47. D. Spearritt and J. M. Colman. Schooling for Newly Arrived Indo-Chinese Refugees: An Evaluation of the Contingency Program for Refugee Children. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1983. p. 252.

48. ibid., pp.252-265.

49. Phil Meade. The Educational Experience of Sydney High School Students: A Comparative Study of Migrant Students of Non-English Speaking Origin and Students Whose Parents Were Born in an English-Speaking Country. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1983. pp. 180-181.

50. ibid. p. 183.

51. ibid., pp. 190-191.

52. ibid., p. 191

53. Department of Education and Youth Affairs. Immigrant and Refugee Youth in the Transition to Work or Further Study. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1983. p. 1..

54. ibid.

55. ibid.